

# Vote Indiana Team Meeting

## Minutes

April 11, 2003

Indiana Government Center South, Training Room 4

## Indianapolis

Todd Rokita, Secretary of State  
Christa Adkins, Indiana Libertarian Party  
Tami Barreto, League of Women voters  
Dick Dodge, Steuben County Council  
Linda Grass, Hancock County Clerk  
Mike Rothrock, Proxy for Dee Ann Hart, Disability Community Representative  
Laura Herzog, Hendricks County Election Supervisor, IVRA representative  
Suellen Jackson-Boner, Governor's Planning Council for People with Disabilities  
Mike Kiefer, Military Representative  
Brad King, Indiana Election Division  
Jon Laramore, Office of the Governor  
Pat Padowski, Proxy for Sally Lasota, Lake County Election Administrator  
Zach Main, Indiana Republican Party  
Regina Moore, Lake County Board of Voter Registration, IVRA representative  
Nick Rhoad, Disability Community Representative  
Kristi Robertson, Indiana Election Division  
Joe Ryan, Military Representative  
Patrica Wilson, Hispanic Community Representative  
Robin Winston, Indiana Democratic Party  
Facilitators: Sarah Taylor and Anita Kolkmeier

Others present were the following:

Kelly Sprague, Manatron, Inc.  
Steve Shamo, MicroVote Corp.  
Cris Fulford, Attain/Covoh, Inc.  
Julia Vaughn, Count Us In  
Tom Gallagher, Indiana Protection & Advocacy Services  
Bill McCully, Quest Information Systems  
Nick Hess, Common Cause Indiana  
Julie Booth, Accenture  
Jeff Mooers, Covansys

At 1:05 p.m., Indiana Secretary of State called the meeting to order. Secretary Rokita asked team members if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes from February 28, 2003. None were submitted.

Secretary Rokita introduced the draft state plan and suggested that the team is in the final stretch of the process. The draft incorporates ideas and suggestions from meeting notes, 3 pieces of legislation introduced this session (SB 268, HB 1541 and ?) and when there were gaps to fill: other state plans.

Sarah Taylor reviewed Section 1 pertaining to the use of requirements payment. Suellen Jackson-Boner questioned the lack of mention about statewide voter file connectivity with Family Social Services Agency (its' programs that involve registration activities) and other full service voter registration agencies. Brad King explained that in the Statewide Voter File subgroup that connectivity and receipt of electronic data is envisioned with the Bureau of Motor Vehicles, Indiana Department of Correction and Department of Health.

Robin Winston and Laura Herzog both asked for a better understanding of the re-issuance of the Quantity Purchase Agreement with the idea that the Secretary of State would enter into a contractual relationship with one voting system vendor. Robin and Todd both noted that this draft plan mentions dollar figures for certain items but that they both expect a competitive bidding process to drive the costs down. **The Voting Equipment subgroup will need to review the suggested tier process and make any recommendations or changes.** Brad pointed out that the 55.1 million dollar figure is an estimate that he hopes will increase. Colonel Ryan noted that the document may want to mention the fax balloting process available to the military/overseas voters currently and the idea that he thinks electronic voting is not too far off into the future. Jon Laramore feels strongly that not everyone coming to the polls should show an id.

Section 2 describes how the state will monitor and distribute the requirements payment. Sarah described that the relationship between the state and the county for receipt of any voting equipment or the implementation of the statewide voter file will be spelled out in legal documents prescribing the roles and responsibilities of each party. Performance will be measured by goals set out in Section 8. Jon asked who the 'state' is and whether any of these roles should be established by rule promulgation or set in statute.

Sarah overviewed Section 3 regarding training and education. The goals listed come directly from meeting notes of the Training and Education subgroup. Robin suggested we consider making as much information web based as possible. It could be placed on the Secretary of State's homepage and also have an icon on the main page of the Access Indiana site directing voters to information. Tami asked Sarah if it was on purpose that she left it unclear whether or not certain training was required. Sarah responded that the Accessibility subgroup felt strongly that voting equipment monies not be released until the counties certified that their polling locations were accessible and that they had worked with a local advisory council made up of elderly voters or voters with disabilities. Suellen commented that we use the term "materials in accessible format."

Anita Kolkmeier reviewed Section 4 and Section 5 for the team members. Anita said Section 4 describes our current statute for voting systems standards along with language introduced this legislative session for full compliance with the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA). Section 5 asks for information pertaining to the Fund and how it will be administered. Tami inquired how often the budget committee meets so local government can apply more often than the legislative session. She was assured that Indiana's budget committee meets throughout the year. Robin inquired if the co-directors of the Indiana Election Division will help advise on distribution since they work closely with the local election officials. Secretary Rokita responded by saying Yes!

Section 6 asks how the state will use requirements payment to carry out activities required in Title III of HAVA and what portion will be used. Anita reviewed the chart on page 7 showing what dollars are expected to reach Indiana. Secretary Rokita then reviewed the distribution table on page 9. Jon asked why there was a prioritization suggested in the last box. Todd again reminded members that this document was a draft for discussion purposes only. He imagines further discussions needing to occur at the subgroup level before the team will lock in the final proposal. Suellen reminded team members that having new technology in the polling places is great but it won't matter if pollworkers don't know how to use the voting equipment. Therefore, she suggested that some of the remaining 32% be redistributed to Training and Education. Linda Grass commented that training pollworkers too long would also backfire. Brad recalled discussion in Denver during training for election directors that HAVA money is just an infusion and is not intended for the long run. He likes the suggestion of a strategic reserve. Mike Rothrock inquired about monies being designated for physical upgrades to polling places. Laura wanted to remind team members that the year 2005 is reprecincting and her county due to growth will increase their number of precincts. She suggested that part of the 32% remaining be set aside for additional voting equipment needs. Zach Main wanted to make sure that a trust fund is set up for the statewide voter file. He believes this is Indiana's chance to do something right and he wants to make sure proper funding will be in place for future needs like on going maintenance. Secretary Rokita stated that there would be a competitive bidding process for the statewide voter file. The 11 million dollar figure in the document is for discussion only. Todd also wants to make sure that any duplicate elimination program monies be redirected to the maintenance of the statewide voter file. He suggested that the Indiana General Assembly make a commitment in this regards. Robin wants to know if voting system vendors will be able to meet the demand for new equipment. He also suggests that language be in place for the QPA stating that the figures "reflect the fiscal status of the state." **Secretary Rokita will ask the National Association of Secretaries of State about the supply and demand situation HAVA creates.** Col. Ryan would like to see training and education monies earmarked for a voter guide, perhaps a separate web page, to provide quick and easy access to election information for military personnel that are given short notice about their next assignment. Jon would like for the group to consider squeezing 4 million dollars or so from other upper boxes to purchase a second DRE in precincts. It is clear to him that the local practitioners in the group have commented that many precincts would require additional DREs. He doesn't believe the strategic reserve should go for voting

equipment. Brad said that the election division has been told by voting system vendors that a calculation should be based on 1 DRE for every 400 voters reporting to a precinct. Jon feels the county is in the best position to decide what their needs are beyond 1 DRE per polling location. Brad also wanted to make a point for the good of the order concerning the short time frame that states and counties have to apply for Health and Human Services grants for accessibility. Zach emphasized that he thought the state should apply. (my notes reflect that Robin then said “free up from voter file??????”) **Jon will help secure a speaker on competitive bidding.** Todd then threw out to the Voting Equipment subgroup whether or not the state should bid paper ballots to help hold costs down for those counties on optical scan systems. Todd also commented that the county must maintain their level of maintenance as prescribed in HAVA. Robin feels strongly that party officials should also sit on the statewide voter file technical advisory committee.

Section 7 discusses the state’s level of maintenance of effort. There were no questions following Sarah’s brief description.

Section 8 lays out the performance measures and goals for carrying out the plan. Sarah reviewed each table. Jon wanted to go on the record concerning the level of expertise already in existence at state government for implementing a statewide system like the voter file. Some of those experiences were not good however all have learned from both types of experiences. **Secretary Rokita asked Jon to identify some state people to be tapped for their experience in developing a statewide system.** Suellen observed that the current measuring tools listed measure process not outcome. She likes the idea of an exit poll for voters concerning any problems they had voting and asking if they received any information. She also supports testing pollworkers. Suellen also thought looking at the complaints received would help measure the effectiveness of pollworker training. Robin thinks the state should print materials to be distributed to voters on Election Day asking them to call with their id and the last 4 digits of their social security number. This would help voter file maintenance and help meet the statutory requirement that pollworkers ask a voter for the identification number. Robin also would like to see Kentucky’s practice of distributing “I voted today” stickers be considered in Indiana. It’s cheap and not voluminous. Brad thought we could ask voters if there was something they didn’t understand during their voting experience. These results could help target future voter education and pollworker training ideas. Kristi reminded members that the Voter’s Bill of Rights has passed the Indiana Election Commission and will be a useful tool in disseminating information. Brad really likes the idea of targeting the people who do show up from a cost effectiveness standpoint. Col. Ryan suggested that 2.c. would be a good place to language about military/overseas voters receiving information through the web.

Section 9 describes the state based administrative complaint procedures. Anita said screeners at the Indiana Election Division (IED) trained to look for Title III of HAVA violations would answer the toll free phone line. Upon having a conversation that seemed to meet those requirements, the screener would direct the caller to place their complaint in writing. A form would be developed to send to the voter or the form would

be available on the web. After receipt of the written complaint, the IED would investigate and bring it to the Indiana Election Commission (IEC) for issuance of a report. If no final determination is made or the IEC vote ends in a tie, the complaint would go to the Secretary of State who would have 60 days for a determination. Tami asked about the next to last paragraph on page 21 regarding the future possibility that the procedure would start with the secretary of state. Jon wanted to know if HAVA requires judicial review. **Jon will research if the Secretary of State is subject to judicial review in this situation.** Robin would like to see non-partisan participation in the resolution. He has no concerns with Todd as an officeholder but has overall concerns about the process. Jon has concerns about the Governor's appointments to the IEC and what impact it may have on this discussion. Brad said the process would help identify problems and hopefully avoid litigation. **The Election Administration subgroup will review this process at their next meeting and make any recommendations or changes.**

Sarah summarized Section 10 for the team. She pointed out that a county has the option under this proposal to select their own voting system vendor off the QPA and be reimbursed at the amount that assumed full participation of all counties. Jon asked if training money is available to counties in a grant program format. Laura stressed the counties must have a say in voter outreach. Brad kindly reminded members that wherever the money goes, so goes the audit trail. Suellen questioned how long the money would be stretched. **Training and Education subgroup will be asked to review these points at their next meeting.**

Sarah quickly pointed out the highlights in Sections 11, 12 and 13.

#### Public Comment

Cris Fulford, Attain, Inc., volunteered her recent knowledge on voting system standards. Chris pointed out Section 255 in the Telecommunications Act. She also referred to Senate Bill 477 and its guidance for clerks. She suggested contacting Laura Laramore and Bill Pierce (Anita check government phone book please) of the Department of Administration for assistance. Secretary Rokita asked if Chris would be available to represent Attain at a meeting with him to also include Bill and Laura. Chris also agreed to speak further with the Voting Equipment subgroup.

Steve Shamo, MicroVote Corp., said his company serves one-third of Indiana voters on their voting system. Steve is leery of fellow vendors when it comes to certifying accessibility. He said some counties would be caught off guard by the need for outside help for the application of voice over activation. It is also costly for the outside help. Steve recommends a blind test of vendors. The \$4000 dollar figure works well for counties with more than 400 precincts. He referred to Putnam County who was able to migrate off punchcards to DREs by recognizing that their paper and supply costs under punchcard would need to be reallocated to a lease purchase plan for DREs.

Nick Hess, Common Cause of Indiana, thanked the team for their hard work. Nick referred to the ID issue and says he thinks it slows down the voting process on Election

Day. He would like to see a higher percent of HAVA dollars for training, as it is the most important component. Nick also highlighted the use of voter and candidate guides as useful tools. Penetration rates for Internet use in Indiana are about two-thirds of Indiana's citizens use the Internet. Florida has an untold story from November of 2000 because 80,000 voters did not get to vote. The Indiana Election Commission needs an overhaul for dealing with conflict. It is very ineffective.

Julia Vaughn, Count Us In, suggested that the new voting equipment would not work well without an education component. Julia would like to see the 4.3% of HAVA dollars slated for training and education bumped up to 10%. This amount ensures correct information is given to voters. She thinks pollworker training needs to be measured probably by a test. She suggests you could start by planting questions with voters and review the outcome. According to Julia, HAVA's job isn't to level the playing field for the counties that already purchased systems. Requesting an id from all voters goes too far and will produce long voter lines.

Prior to adjournment, the schedule was revised as follows: no subgroup meetings on Friday, May 2, 2003 and Training and Education will add a meeting on May 9, 2003 at 2:45 p.m.